DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 139 897 UD 017 045

AUTHOR Kelly, Eleanor A.
TITLE Title I English as a Second Language Program. Non-Public Schools Program; School Year 1974-1975.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 34p.; New York City Board of Education Function No. 09-59629 ; Appendices may be marginally legible due to print quality of the original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Audiolingual Methods; Audiolingual Skills; Elementary Secondary Education; *English (Second Language); English Education; English Programs; *Non English Speaking; *Oral English; *Private Schools; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Speech Skills
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this program was to provide instruction in the English language with emphasis on oral English to eligible non-English speaking pupils enrolled in Title I non-public schools. The major objective of the program was to enable the pupils to achieve competency and fluency in the use of the English language and to assist them in attaining an achievement level appropriate for their grade level placement. This was accomplished by providing the students with experiences in language within functional settings through an audio-lingual method. Instruction was conducted in small groups of from four to eight for a period of forty to sixty minutes for two to five days a week. Varied learning materials were used. A total of 3,808 pupils from kindergarten through the twelfth grade participated. An analysis of pre and post test scores revealed that all grades made gains of from almost five to seven months with the exception of grades ten, eleven, and twelve which had a gain of one year and one month. There apeared to be no significant difference among treatments where there was a combination of English as a Second Language and/or speech or guidance or when the treatment was only English as a Second Language. The fact that there were no significant differences in improvement among treatments suggested that the supportive services may have been helpful to those pupils who otherwise may not have functioned as well in the English as a Second Language classroom. (Author/AM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED139897

EVALUATION REPORT

Function #09-59629

TITLE I ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE PROGRAM

NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS PROGRAM

(School Year 1974-1975)

Prepared by

Eleanor A. Kelly

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

An evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10) performed for the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1974-75 school year.

UD017045

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Dr. Anthony J. Polemeni, Director

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	THE PROGRAM	1
II.	EVALUATION PROCEDURES	2
	Evaluation Objective #1	2
	Evaluation Objective #2	2
	Subjects	2
	Testing	2
	Data Collection	2
	Limitations on Data Analysis	3
	Data Analysis	3
	Evaluation Objective #3	4
III.	FINDINGS BASED UPON THE EVALUATION OBJECTIVES	5
	Evaluation Objective #1	5
	Evaluation Objective #2	7
	Evaluation Objective #3	9
	Implementation	9
	Staff	9
	Facilities	10
	Supervision and Training	10
	Materials and Equipment	10
	Students	11
	Instruction	11
	Cross-reference and Impact of Other Programs	11
	Discrepancy Analysis	12
	Implementation of Recommendations Made in Prior Study	13
IV.	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	15
	Summary of Major Findings	15
	Conclusions	17
	Recommendations	17

Appendix

A	MIR Form #28
	Data Loss Form

LIST OF TABLES

Table		page
1.	Mean and T Values for Grades Kindergarten through Twelve..	5
2.	Average Mean Gain and F Ratio-ESL only vs. ESL and Speech.	7
3.	Average Mean Gain and F Ratio-ESL only vs. ESL and Guidance.....	7

THE PROGRAM

The purpose of the program was to provide instruction in the English Language with emphasis on oral English for eligible non-English speaking pupils enrolled in the Title I non-public schools. The major objective was to enable participating pupils to achieve competency and fluency in the use of the English language and to assist them in attaining an achievement level appropriate for their grade level placement.

This was accomplished by providing the students with experiences in language within functional settings through an audio-lingual approach in small groups of from four to eight for a period of forty to sixty minutes for two to five days per week. Varied and appropriate learning materials and audio-visual equipment were used.

The program was in effect from September 1974 through June 30, 1975 and was implemented in ninety two (92) schools during the fall term and in ninety-five (95) schools during the spring term.

A total of 3,808 eligible non-public school pupils from grades kindergarten through twelve were serviced and were selected on the basis of referrals from the principals, classroom teachers, guidance counsellors, and on occasion from other Title I teachers in the schools. In addition the ESL teachers administered the total auditory test of the Stanford Achievement Test and gave an oral proficiency test to each entering pupil in order to determine his need of ESL instruction.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Evaluation objective #1 This was to determine whether as a result of participation in the program the competency and fluency in the use of English by the students would show a statistically significant difference between pre-test scores and post-test scores.

Evaluation objective #2 This was to determine the various effects of treatment combination involving the supportive services of speech and clinical guidance.

Subjects - All participants in the program were tested.

Testing The Total Auditory Test of the 1974 Stanford Achievement Test was administered as a pre-test in April 1974 and also in September 1974. The primary level form A was given to grades two through eight while the intermediate level form A was given to grades nine through twelve. A post test of the same test and levels, form B was administered to these students in late April 1975.

The Test of Basic Experiences was administered as a pre-test in January 1975 and as a post-test in April 1975 to all kindergarten and first grade pupils.

Data Collection - Test data along with other pupil data requested by the evaluator were recorded by the ESL teachers on optical scanning sheets, hand delivered by the teachers to the coordinator's office, and picked up by the evaluator the last week in May. Data was collected on 3,808 pupils.

Limitations on Data Analysis - A total of 2,987 pairs of pre and post test scores were analyzed. Pre or post test scores were not available for 440 pupils for a number of reasons. Sixty-five (65) students were absent for either the pre or post test, 216 were reported as transients, 54 were withdrawn from the program before post testing since they had made sufficient progress and no longer were in need of the service, 71 entered the program too late to be pre tested, 25 scores were considered invalid, 7 scores were recorded inaccurately and data on 2 students were misplaced by a teacher. The evaluator rejected 381 pairs of scores because other necessary information such as the type of treatment received or the grade level of the pupil was not available.

A true analysis of variance was limited by the fact that the groups receiving the three different treatments were not identical at the start of the program since some pupils were handicapped by the need for either guidance or speech.

No analysis of variance was performed for grades 9, 10, 11 and 12 since the total was less than 30 in each group.

No analysis was made of the paraprofessional component since less than 30% of the teachers had full time assistance.

Data Analysis - A correlated t test was performed for each of the grade groups. In addition an analysis of variance was performed for ESL only vs ESL with speech and for ESL only vs ESL with guidance. Separate analyses were done for grades 2 and 3, 4, 5 and 6, 7 and 8. All data analyses were done by computer.

Evaluation objective #3 In order to determine the extent to which the program was implemented in the schools the evaluator visited 20 of the elementary schools and both high schools involved in the program. A list of these schools was assigned to the evaluator by the director of the non-public school programs and was therefore neither chosen nor randomly selected by the evaluator. Pre-visits were made to all twenty elementary schools during November and December while post visits to all twenty elementary schools and both high schools were made in April, May and June. Two or three groups of students were observed during each visit and interviews were conducted with more than half of the ESL teachers either in their schools or at staff meetings. In addition interviews were conducted with almost all of the principals and many of the regular classroom teachers and some of the Title I teachers in the Speech and Guidance components in the schools visited. The researcher observed each of the ESL supervisors in the field and had numerous meetings with them and the project coordinator during the school year. In addition the researcher attended many of the small group teachers' workshops and large group staff meetings.

FINDINGS BASED UPON THE EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

Evaluation Objective #1

In order to determine whether as a result of participation in the program there would be statistically significant difference between the pre and post test scores a correlated t test was performed for the various grade levels and treatments. The results are recorded in table 1 below:

TABLE 1

MEAN AND T VALUES FOR GRADES KINDERGARTEN THROUGH TWELVE

MEAN AND T VALUES FOR KINDERGARTEN (raw scores)

Treatment	N	Pre-test Mean Score	Post-test Mean Score	Diff.	Value of T	Level of Significance
ESL only	104	9.2	14.1	.49	11.99	.001

MEAN AND T VALUES FOR GRADE 1 (raw scores)

ESL only	617	15.88	20.50	4.6	29.88	.001
ESL & Guid.	120	15.65	20.50	4.8	10.77	.001
ESL & Sp.	200	16.54	20.64	4.1	15.09	.001

MEAN AND T VALUES FOR GRADES 2 & 3 (grade equivalents)

ESL only	569	1.12	1.73	.61	26.51	.001
ESL & Guid.	187	1.12	1.63	.50	13.13	.001
ESL & Sp.	285	1.10	1.68	.57	12.48	.001

MEAN AND T VALUES FOR GRADES 4&5&6 (grade equivalents)

ESL only	398	1.82	2.51	.69	19.52	.001
ESL & Guid.	130	1.93	2.54	.60	10.07	.001
ESL & Sp.	148	1.92	2.63	.70	13.85	.001

MEAN AND T VALUES FOR GRADES 7&8 (grade equivalents)

Treatment	N	Pre-test Mean Score	Post-test Mean Score	Diff.	Value of T	Level of Significance
ESL only	109	2.12	2.54	.41	5.95	.001
ESL & Guid.	44	2.3	3.0	.64	4.6	.001
ESL & Sp.	32	1.5	2.2	.70	4.97	.001
MEAN AND T VALUES FOR GRADE 9 (grade equivalents)						
All treatments grouped together	23	3.75	4.19	.43	2.28	.001
MEAN AND T VALUES FOR GRADES 10&11&12 (grade equivalents)						
All treatments grouped together	21	4.07	5.22	1.14	5.83	.001

As indicated in Table 1 highly significant improvement was made at all grade levels as indicated by the correlated t test with significance at the .001 level. Gains of from almost five months to seven months were made.

Evaluation Objective #2

In order to determine the various effects of treatment combinations involving the supportive services of clinical guidance and speech an analysis of variance was done. Raw scores were used for first graders while grade equivalents were used for all others. The results are recorded in the Table 2 below and are organized by grade groups and treatment received.

TABLE 2

AVERAGE MEAN GAIN & F RATIO - ESL ONLY VS. ESL AND SPEECH

Grade	Total N	N ESL only	N ESL & SP.	Average Mean Gain ESL only	Average Mean Gain ESL & Sp.	F Ratio	Level of Significance
1st	817	617	200	4.6	4.1	2.80	.10
2 & 3	854	569	285	.61	.57	.79	.37
4&5&6	546	398	148	.68	.71	.08	.68
7 & 8	142	109	32	.41	.70	3.7	.06

As indicated in Table 2 there was no significant difference between the ESL only and the ESL and Speech treatments.

Although in the seventh and eighth grade group the average mean gain was .41 for the ESL only treatment and .70 for the ESL with Speech treatment, the difference was not significant.

TABLE 3

AVERAGE MEAN GAIN & F RATIO - ESL ONLY VS. ESL AND GUIDANCE

Grade	Total N	N ESL only	N ESL & Guid.	Average Mean Gain ESL only	Average Mean Gain ESL & Guid.	F Ratio	Level of Significance
1st	737	617	120	4.6(raw score)	4.8	.3	.58
2 & 3	756	569	187	.61	.51	4.9	.04
4&5&6	528	398	130	.68	.61	1.2	.26
7 & 8	153	109	44	.41	.64	2.6	.10

As indicated in Table 3 there was no significant difference between the ESL only and the ESL and Guidance treatments.

Again, the seventh and eighth grade group had an average mean gain of .64 for the ESL and Guidance treatment as opposed to a gain of .41 for the ESL only treatment. However, in this case also the difference was not significant according to the F ratio.

Evaluation Objective #3 In order to achieve the implementation objective the researcher studied data collected during observations and interviews and analyzed print-outs of student, teacher and program information. The results follow:

Implementation - The program was fully implemented in 92 schools during the fall term and in 95 schools during the spring term. It was in effect from the beginning of September to the end of June. Service was provided two days a week for 54% of the pupils and three days a week for 35.2%. Only 5.5% received instruction five days a week. The average number of days in attendance was 63.

Staff - The program provided for 65.2 positions which were covered by 78 teachers approximately 35 of whom were licensed ESL teachers. Almost all were qualified and very conscientious. Approximately 80% were in the program for two or more years. Many of the teachers, about thirty-five, were enrolled in an in-service ESL course during the fall term and five were enrolled in a masters program.

There were three supervisors who observed and assisted the teachers in the field, conducted orientation meetings, small group workshops, and staff meetings during the year. They visited each teacher about four times and provided in-service training and on the job assistance in areas of planning, grouping, teaching methods, and learning materials. They also assisted with administrative affairs at the central office.

The program was directed by one project coordinator, who administrated and coordinated the program effectively.

Facilities - Facilities were generally very good. Most teachers had a classroom or a small room suitable for small group instruction and the storage of materials. In approximately 10% of the schools the program was not assigned a room and classes were subsequently held in a section of the auditorium, gym or stage.

Supervision and Training - Before classes began there were three orientation meetings for all ESL teachers. In addition, each teacher had one meeting a month with the supervisor and a small group of teachers from the surrounding schools. These took place at the newly formed storage sites where materials and equipment were made available for exchange among the teachers. The teachers were very pleased with the setting up of the storage sites, with the materials available and with the meetings where they were able to share ideas. Periodic large group staff meetings were held for all teachers. As previously mentioned, the supervisors visited each teacher approximately four times during the year, arranged for intervisitations, and conducted small group workshops when the non-public schools were closed. Teachers indicated that they would prefer more assistance early in September. They also stated that intervisitations were very valuable and requested that there be more of them perhaps by teams of teachers and under the guidance of a supervisor.

Materials and Equipment - Appropriate and sufficient equipment and materials which were culturally oriented and interesting were generally available to all teachers in the program and additional materials were made available throughout the year through the

storage site exchange method. A few teachers indicated that some of the equipment did arrive late in the term due to poor delivery practices on the part of companies. A few teachers indicated the need for more learning equipment, especially the tape recorder. Most teachers used the materials and equipment effectively while a few did not make them an integral part of the program.

Students - The program serviced the needs of the specific target population for which it was designed. It provided intensive instruction in the English language to pupils whose native language was other than English. Spanish was the native language of 71.7% of the students, Italian 8.8%, Creole 5.6%, Greek 3.4%, Oriental 2.6%, French 2.3%, Slavic 2.2%, Yiddish or Hebrew .9%, Portugues 4%, Hungarian .2%, German .1% and other 1.7%. Approximately half (51.5%) of the pupils were first and second graders and less than 1.5% were ninth through twelfth graders.

Instruction - The classes as observed were conducted by generally competent teachers in small groups of from four to eight pupils. Emphasis was placed on group instruction with less attention given to individual work. Teachers indicated that when attendance fell to three students in a group it was difficult to carry out a lesson effectively since there was less opportunity for interaction. The most effective grouping was considered to be six.

Cross-reference and Impact of Other Programs - The Title I supportive services of Speech and Clinical Guidance had direct cross reference to and impact on the English as a Second Language

Program. The ESL program identified those pupils in need of these supportive services and vice-versa and worked with them in meeting the needs of these children. Analysis of the data revealed that 56.5% of the participating students received the ESL treatment only, 19.7% received ESL plus Speech, 14.4% received ESL plus guidance, and 9.3% received ESL plus Speech and Guidance. The findings relating to the effects of the various treatments have already been discussed. The District Offices "plug-in" program for providing paraprofessional assistance provided for extra individualization and additional aid to teachers in a few schools. Analysis of the data indicated that 17.5% of the 3,808 pupils received full time paraprofessional services.

Discrepancy Analysis - The program was fully and effectively implemented in the schools and the aspects coincided with the descriptions found in the proposal. A discrepancy existed in that during the fall the program was implemented in 92 schools rather than the proposed 94. During the spring term the program took place in 95 schools. Since in one school there was a strict dress regulation it was difficult to assign a teacher. The program was discontinued early in the fall term in the other school because of lack of facilities.

The program was to continue through June 30. However, when the non-public school closed before the official public school closing, actual ESL classes were not held through the end of June. Instead the teachers engaged in other activities such as conducting parent teachers workshops, working in district offices or

teaching as substitutes in the public schools. Others attended ESL meetings or made intervisitations.

Implementation of Recommendations Made in Prior Study - In the previous study four major recommendations were forwarded. All of these were implemented during this school year.

To satisfy the recommendation that another formal test be used in addition to the standardized test to diagnose oral language proficiency the ESL teachers utilized project Minimal Language Goals. Further development of this list is under way since many of the teachers indicated the need for more specific statements and methods of diagnosing and evaluating. In addition the TOBE was administered to kindergarten and first graders. The test was chosen because it was a more appropriate diagnostic test for first graders and suitable for kindergarteners.

In response to the suggestion that orientation sessions be held for regular classroom teachers in the host schools, wherever possible an orientation session was provided if not at the start of the year then during the term. In addition about 75% of the teachers participated in at least one meeting with the non-public school staff.

More and varied low ability high interest materials were ordered and supplied to various schools in conjunction with the recommendation. Materials particularly suited to high school students were observed in use in both high schools.

Since a final recommendation was that more time be allotted the ESL program in the schools, schedules were rearranged

wherever possible in order to provide extra services where space was available and where there was student need. As a result extended services were provided in ten schools.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of Major Findings

An analysis of pre and post test scores revealed that all grades made gains of from almost five to seven months with the exception of grades ten, eleven, and twelve which mad a gain of one year and one month. The correlated t test indicated high significance in improvement at the .001 level for all groups.

There was no significant difference in achievement between the ESL only treatment and the ESL with Guidance. Although the seventh and eighth grade group had an average mean gain of .41 for ESL only as opposed to an average mean gain of .64 for ESL with Guidance, the F test indicated significance at only the .10 level.

There was no significant difference in achievement between the ESL only treatment and the ESL with Guidance treatment. Although the seventh and eighth grade group had a greater average mean gain when they had a combination of ESL and Speech (.70) as opposed to ESL only (.41), significance was reached with the F test at only the .06 level.

The pupils identified as needing supportive assistance in either guidance or speech made as much improvement as those who were not handicapped.

The program was effectively coordinated and fully implemented in the schools. The facilities were generally good. Only 10% of the schools were without a room assignment. The supervisors and teachers were qualified and competent and there were highly an-

propriate and sufficient materials. These factors along with the small group instruction were the greatest strengths of the program.

Most of the materials and equipment were used effectively although some teachers hesitated to use some of the equipment and indicated that they could use more specific training in the use of these machines with individual and groups of pupils. They all stated that their supervision was excellent but suggested that they could benefit from more on-site assistance when being given new materials and equipment.

Some of the host schools were not completely familiar with the goals of the ESL program and therefore were not as able to work in conjunction with the ESL teachers.

The teachers considered the intervisitations very valuable and asked for more such visits perhaps by a small team along with a supervisor. This would provide for more interaction among teachers and more guided analysis especially for new teachers.

Many of the teachers felt they needed a little more specific direction as to the goals to work toward in the program. They suggested that a list of specific skills be developed and made available to them or that the Minimal Language Goals sheet be further developed in more detail.

The teachers stated that the small group workshops were very helpful since they could share ideas and have more contact with other ESL teachers. The establishment of storage sites

where materials and equipment could be stored and exchanged was also considered a very valuable addition to the program this year.

The recommendations from the prior study were implemented to a great degree this school year.

Conclusions

The ESL program proved to be effective. Providing small group instruction to non-English speaking pupils using the audio-lingual approach can be considered an effective way to improve their fluency and competency in the English language as measured by pre and post test scores.

There appeared to be no significant difference among treatments where there was a combination of ESL and/or speech or guidance or when the treatment was only ESL. The fact that there were no significant differences in improvement among treatments suggests that the supportive services may have been helpful to those pupils who otherwise may not have functioned as well in the ESL classroom.

The success of the program may be attributed to the small group instruction with opportunities for oral expression and interaction, teacher competency, effective coordination and supervision of the program, and continuity of the teaching staff, the availability of suitable materials and equipment.

Recommendations

The ESL program should definitely be continued since highly significant improvement was made. The supportive services might also be continued since pupils with special problems were helped to achieve to the same degree as the others.

The following suggestions are forwarded for consideration:

1. Publicize the ESL program throughout all the Title I Non-Public schools so that the principals and staff can be better informed of the goals and techniques of ESL before they are required to file their requests for services.

2. Once the program is assigned to the host school its staff should be made thoroughly familiar with the program and have closer contact with the ESL teachers so that both may attain a better understanding of the needs of the students and how these may be attained. Where possible the ESL supervisors should work with the teachers in implementing this.

3. Encourage all ESL teachers to utilize the materials and machines as an integral part of the program. Live demonstrations with pupils may be valuable.

4. Assist the teachers in diagnosing more specifically individual pupil needs and in planning for more individualization of instruction.

5. Provide each teacher with a taperecorder.

6. Further refine the Minimal Language Goals form to provide for more specific identification of skills and more effective methods of measurement.

7. Continue to increase the number of intervisitations by teachers according to need and feasibility. When possible attempt to observe as a team of two teachers and a supervisor so that there may be more guided observations, learning and interaction.

8. Increase the number of schools receiving five day service.

9. Provide for a full time secretary to assist with the many administrative details.

10. Develop an evaluation design which will more accurately analyze the impact of the supportive services of speech and guidance.

APPENDIX A

Use Table 28 for norm referenced achievement data not applicable to Table 26. (See "Instructions" Item 5 before completing this table.)

28. Standardized Test Results

In the table below, enter the requested assessment information about the tests used to evaluate the effectiveness of major project components/activities in achieving desired objectives. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary. 27

Component Code	Activity Code	Test Used 1/	Form Pre	Form Post	Level Pre	Level Post	Total N 2/	Group ID 3/	Number Tested 4/ N	Number Tested 5/	Pretest Date	Pretest Mean	Pretest SD 6/	Posttest Date	Posttest Mean	Posttest SD 6/	Statistical Data 7/ Test	Statistical Data 8/ Value	Subgroup 9/
6142	720	TOBE '72	L	L	Prim	Prim	127	kg.	104	6	1/75	9.2	4.71	4/75	14.1	5.10	t	11.99	treatment I
6142	720	TOBE '72	L	L	Prim	Prim	1131	1st	937	6	1/75	16.5 15.6	4.20 5.35	4/75	20.6 20.5	4.42 7.80	F	2.88 .3	treatment II treatment III
6142	720	SAT '74	A	B	Prim	Prim	1371	243	1041	1	4/74 9/74	1.10 1.12	.72 .46	4/75	1.68 1.63	.66 .67	F	.79 4.9	treatment II treatment III
6142	720	SAT '74	A	B	Prim	Prim	865	24	676	1	4/74 9/74	1.82 1.93	.81 .80	4/75	2.63 2.54	1.04 .91	F	1.08 1.2	treatment II treatment III
6142	720	SAT '74	A	B	Prim	Prim	241	748	185	1	4/74 9/74	1.5 2.3	.97 1.14	4/75	2.2 3.0	1.13 1.10	F	3.7 2.6	treatment II treatment III
6142	720	SAT '74	A	B	Int.	Int.	29	9	23	1	4/74 9/74	3.75	2.27	4/75	4.19	2.43	t	2.28	all treatments combined
6142	720	SAT '74	A	B	Int.	Int.	28	26	21	1	4/74 9/74	4.07	2.42	4/75	5.22	2.29	t	5.83	all treatments combined

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58; CAT-70, etc.)

2/ Total number of participants in the activity.

3/ Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 5). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.

4/ Total number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations.

5/ 1 = grade equivalent; 2 = percentile rank; 3 = z score; 4 = Standard score (publisher's); 5 = stanine; 6 = raw score; 7 = other.

6/ SD = Standard Deviation

7/ Test statistics (e.g., t; F; X^2).

8/ Obtained value

9/ Provide data for the following groups separately: Neglected (code as N), Delinquent (code as D), and Handicapped (code as H). Place the indicated code letter in the last column to signify the subgroup evaluated.

NOTE: **11 cases were recorded greater than 12th grade (error in recording on opscan)**

5 cases recorded as blanks

CODE

treatment I - ESL only
treatment II - ESL and Speech
treatment III - ESL and Guidance

TITLE I ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE PROGRAM NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS PROGRAM Function #09-59629

Dr. Eleanor A. Kelly

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION - DATA LOSS FORM

(attach to MIR, item #30) Function #_____

In this table enter all Data Loss information. Between MIR, item #30 and this form, all participants in each activity must be accounted for. The component and activity codes used in completion of item #30 should be used here so that the two tables match. See definitions below table for further instructions.

Component Code	Activity Code	(1) Group I.D.	(2) Test Used	(3) Total N	(4) Number Tested/ Analyzed	(5) Participants Not Tested/ Analyzed		(6) Reasons why students were not tested, or if tested, were not analyzed	Number/ Reason
						N	%		
6 1 4 2 2	7 2 0	kg.	TOBE'72	127	104	23	18%	absent for either pre or post test	65
6 1 4 2 3	7 2 0	(1)	TOBE"72	1131	937	194	17.2%	transient	216
6 1 4 2 3	7 2 0	(2+3)	SAT"74	1371	1041	330	24%	made sufficient progress and was	
6 1 4 2 4	7 2 0	(4 - 6) 24	SAT"74	865	676	189	21.8%	withdrawn before post testing	54
6 1 4 2 5	7 2 0	(7+8) 25	SAT'74	241	185	56	23.2%	entered program late	71
								invalid score	25

(1) Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 9). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.
(2) Identify the test used and year of publication (MAT-70, SDAT-74, etc.).
(3) Number of participants in the activity.
(4) Number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations found on item#30.
(5) Number and percent of participants not tested and/or not analyzed on item#30.
(6) Specify all reasons why students were not tested and/or analyzed. For each reason specified, provide a separate number count. If any further documentation is available, please attach to this form. If further space is needed to specify and explain data loss, attach additional pages to this form.

~~TITLE I ENGLISH~~ AS A SECOND LANGUAGE PROGRAM NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS PROGRAM

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION - DATA LOSS FORM

Dr. Eleanor A. Kelly

(attach to MIR, item #30) / Function # 09-59629

In this table enter all Data Loss information. Between MIR, item #30 and this form, all participants in each activity must be accounted for. The component and activity codes used in completion of item #30 should be used here so that the two tables match. See definitions below table for further instructions.

Component Code	Activity Code	(1) Group I.D.	(2) Test Used	(3) Total N	(4) Number Tested/ Analyzed	(5) Participants Not Tested/ Analyzed		(6) Reasons why students were not tested, or if tested, were not analyzed	
						N	%		Number/ Reason
6 1 4 2 5	7 2 0	(9) 25	SAT'74	29	23	6	20.6%	Rejected by researcher - - (treatment received was not indicated)	42
6 1 4 2 6	7 2 0	(10-12) 26	SAT'74	28	21	7	25%	Rejected (indicated> grade 12)	11
								Rejected (did not indicate grade level)	5
								Recorded reason for no test inaccurately	7
								Rejected- Had a combination of all treatments (grades 2 - 8)	323
								Data misplaced by teacher	2

(1) Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 9). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.
(2) Identify the test used and year of publication (MAT-70, SDAT-74, etc.).
(3) Number of participants in the activity.
(4) Number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations found on item#30.
(5) Number and percent of participants not tested and/or not analyzed on item#30.
(6) Specify all reasons why students were not tested and/or analyzed. For each reason specified, provide a separate number count. If any further documentation is available, please attach to this form. If further space is needed to specify and explain data loss, attach additional pages to this form.